



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/586,018

10/26/2006

Gregg D. Scheller

54084-62559

9316

21888 7590 06/10/2010

THOMPSON COBURN LLP  
ONE US BANK PLAZA  
SUITE 3500  
ST LOUIS, MO 63101

EXAMINER

CHEN, VICTORIA W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3739

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/10/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDOCKET@THOMPSONCOBURN.COM

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10586018	10/26/2006	SCHELLER ET AL.	54084-62559

THOMPSON COBURN LLP  
ONE US BANK PLAZA  
SUITE 3500  
ST LOUIS, MO 63101

**EXAMINER**

VICTORIA W. CHEN

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3739	20100604
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The reply brief received 4/5/10 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

The examiner would like to note that the suggested language regarding claim 1 and the existing language of applicant's claim 3 are interpreted in a way where they are distinct from each other, specifically in that the suggested language distinguishes that the forward grip member is formed from a plurality of integrally connected resilient arms, whereas applicant's claim 3 simply states that a plurality of resilient arms is integrally connected with the forward grip member. The suggested language is clearer in stating that the forward grip member itself is one unit formed from integrally connected arms. Furthermore, regarding applicant's argument over the definition of "distal" and "end" the examiner maintains that the terms are broad enough as claimed to be interpreted as in the Examiner's Answer mailed 2/5/10.

/Linda C Dvorak/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3739